

The Sun.

WILLIAM M. LAFFAN.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1903.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month	80 Cts.
DAILY, Per Year	8.00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	9.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	75 Cts.

Postage to foreign countries added.

THE SUN, New York City.
PARIS—Rue de la Paix, 12, near Grand Hotel, and
Rue de la Paix, 10, Boulevard des Capucines.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication with the usual articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Governor Bliss's Pension.

It has just occurred to Governor BLISS of Michigan that he doesn't need the pension of \$12 a month granted him by the United States Government for disability. In his letter to the Commissioner of Pensions he says:

"I feel that I have won what I wished, a place on the pension rolls with my comrades of the War of the Rebellion, and I relinquish the pension only because I doubt the propriety of continuing as a pensioner when I am not in need. My disability was fully determined by two examinations, one under Commissioner EVANS and the second under your administration, each conducted by two competent physicians, resulting in an order placing me on the rolls at \$12 a month. My intention was to donate this money to the work of the Grand Army of the Republic, and this I have done."

Governor BLISS's notions of the objects of a pension are original. The disability from which he suffered or suffers has not prevented him from serving as Governor. The State of Michigan pays him for being an able citizen. The United States pays him for being a disabled soldier. That he got a pension seems to show that the examinations accepted by the Pension Bureau are not too severe.

However deserving the work of the Grand Army of the Republic, soldiers are not pensioned for the benefit of that society. Mr. BLISS is understood to be a forehandman man. It is the habit of Republican candidates for Governor of Michigan to make liberal contributions to campaign funds. Governor BLISS was more than able to pay \$12 a month out of his own pocket to the G. A. R. It is difficult to resist the impression that he has been generous at the expense of a too generous Government. And it has taken him some time to find out that he could live without that pension.

He could have afforded to wait for his pension until a general pension bill was passed. Still, let us do honor to Governor BLISS even for his somewhat slow perception of the unnecessary of his pension and the benignity of his disability. It is hard for a man, no matter how forehanded he is, to give up a source of income, however small, and to get money from the Government is "like finding it."

The High Price of Cotton.

Events upon the cotton exchanges in this city and New Orleans have been of more importance in the last two days than occurrences in any other quarter of the financial and business world. The price of cotton, which has for some time been steadily advancing, has now risen to nearly 13 cents a pound for the spot or immediate delivery of the article, while the cost of options for future delivery is but slightly below these figures. Cotton in the local market is now bringing nearly four cents a pound more than it did last year at this time and prevailing prices are the highest known for twenty years.

Many circumstances have combined to produce this result. For two years past, as is well known, reserve stores of cotton all over the world have been well-nigh depleted and successive crop shortages in this country have limited cotton production. Last year three parties of speculators, acting quite independently of each other and following each other in their operations in point of time, managed to advance the price of cotton to about one cent a pound below current quotations. That great rarity in the history of all speculative enterprises, namely, a successful "corner," was engineered in the options for the delivery of cotton in May. This was made possible by two reasons; first, the inability of the great body of speculators in cotton and the majority of those who bought the article for use in spinning mills to estimate rightly the actual size of the crop and the extent of the demands of consumers; and secondly, the very large sums of money, estimated at not less than \$15,000,000 (in large part French capital), which were placed at the command of those undertaking the manipulation. The advance during the last two months in the price of cotton has been due to a growing knowledge of the injuries suffered by the crop in the present season, official reports of these injuries being confirmed by the Government report published on Thursday that the season's crop will amount to only 9,962,039 bales, which is, at the present rate of the consumption of the article, a serious deficiency.

This rise in cotton prices is, of course, very pleasing to the South, and inasmuch as it compels foreign spinners who need our cotton to buy it from us at an abnormally high cost it will increase the balance of our foreign trade, which already runs so heavily in our favor. But there is another side to the situation which must be very gravely considered. It is perfectly obvious that any such sensational advance in the price of cotton as has been described produces wide and deep disturbance in the cotton manufacturing business and in the entire textile trade. In order to conduct their business without loss, even, cotton manufacturers must, if they pay 13 cents a pound for raw cotton, sell cotton cloth on a very much higher basis than has hitherto ruled; and as cotton cloths are bought for the most part by poor rather than by rich people, any great advance will be effected with great difficulty, if, indeed, it can be accomplished at all. A drastic reduction in pay schedules has already been enforced among the 50,000 operatives in the New England cotton mills, and if cotton holds at its present price

these pay schedules must be still further reduced. Thus consumers of cotton and manufacturers of it, mill owners and mill workers alike, will suffer. Speculators in cotton should remember, for their part, that whatever they may think to be a fair price for cotton as adjudged by a theoretical balance drawn between production and consumption, there is a level of cotton prices at which consumers of the market and that no matter how short the cotton crop may be, cotton simply will not be bought for spinning purposes at prohibitive prices.

The cotton spinning industry will undoubtedly suffer severely this winter, but the cotton crop is quite large enough to bring an enormous influx of wealth into the South. At these prices the South will not feel a deficiency of 800,000 bales, and the amount of money let loose there and assured for the near future is already making itself felt. There is no other part of the country which is so prosperous or in which the business outlook rests upon a more substantial foundation. It is an ill wind that blows nobody good.

Mr. Ray Stannard Baker's Testimony.

It is only fair to say that there is no special significance in the fact that Mr. RAY STANNARD BAKER of *McClure's* was directly from the witness stand in the Wood investigation to luncheon at the White House. No impropriety is discernible in Mr. ROOSEVELT's invitation to Mr. BAKER to lunch with him that day, and there was certainly none in Mr. BAKER's acceptance.

The incident would have interest only upon the assumption that the testimony of Mr. BAKER in regard to the origin of *McClure's* magazine article attacking Gen. BROOKE was in some way rendered more favorable to Gen. WOOD by the President's hospitality. For such an assumption there is absolutely no warrant.

In the first place, Mr. BAKER is not a man likely to be so influenced. In the second place, there is no apparent reason for an attempt to influence him by suggestion in the form of edibles, or otherwise. His testimony before the Senate Committee, so far as it has been reported unofficially, agrees perfectly with his previous statements regarding the affair, made privately at various times during many months past. He has had only one story to tell, and this, according to our information, has been straightforward and uniformly and candidly consistent. The gist of the evidence Mr. BAKER was able to give must have been well known to all concerned long before he was invited to luncheon.

Until the exact text of the questions and answers in both Major RUNCIE's testimony and Mr. BAKER's are available for comparison, it is impossible to say whether the two witnesses contradict each other in any essential particular or raise any issue of veracity between RUNCIE and BAKER.

From the reports that have been published, however, we should say that except perhaps in minor details which which recollections might honestly differ, there is necessarily no clash between the RUNCIE story and BAKER's. The latter gentleman went from the first frank admission of Gen. WOOD and a promoter of his fortunes. He had the right to be. No discredit attaches to any of his efforts in Wood's interest, so far as we know.

The issue of veracity is between RUNCIE and WOOD. The incidental cooperation of Mr. BAKER was wholly free from the restrictions of military discipline, and was legitimate.

That Major RUNCIE regarded Mr. BAKER as a cordial sympathizer in the attempt to promote Wood at Gen. BROOKE's expense is to be inferred from the language of RUNCIE's letter to BAKER accompanying the manuscript of the article afterward published in the *North American Review*. "There seems to be a dawning light round Washington," wrote RUNCIE to BAKER, in forwarding the article, "and it may be the beginning of a better day for Wood as well as for Cuba."

A Criticism of "The Sun."

We have received a letter from an esteemed correspondent, complaining that while we have printed letters urging the restriction of the present "excessive immigration" we ourselves have not said "one word about naturalization, its polluting effect on the ballot and its corrupting influence in our elections, though nothing is more notorious than the utter unfitness of these ignorant Slav immigrants for citizenship and the right of the suffrage."

This criticism of THE SUN proceeds, thus:

"Why this profound silence on so important a matter? THE SUN, while it gave a seeming endorsement of those letters, by the publication of them, had not an editorial word of commendation or condemnation.

"It is because the naturalized vote has already grown to such size and potency that the papers and parties dare not assail the law that has created it and demand its repeal and the substitution of a restricted naturalization as a reward and distinction for benefits and honors conferred on the country by men of foreign birth, and for a judicial revision of all existing certificates of naturalization and a suspension of their voting privilege until so revised."

If silence on this momentous question is not for the reason suggested, what in the name of patriotism is the reason?

the effect the ignorant immigrant would have on our civilization and the integrity and purity of our elections.

ALBERT GRANGER.
NEW YORK, Dec. 5.

THE SUN, so far from having kept silent on this subject, has expressed its opinion very plainly and decidedly, and it is that no such evil results of immigration as Mr. GRANGER assumes have appeared in American history, social or political.

Since the great Irish and German immigration which began in the middle of the last century we have received about twenty-five millions of immigrants. So far from our political or social conditions having declined in consequence, there has been steady improvement in them. Except for this immigration, too, the industrial progress made by this country during the past two generations would have been impossible. They have contributed essentially to the growth of American civilization and have brought about a modification in the American character which our history and our present condition show was desirable. Great States which are in the very forefront of American civilization in industry, enterprise and every moral and political characteristic of a civilized and exemplary society, have been built up by this immigration. The turbulent excesses of the politics of a previous period and the rancor and corruption of it have been succeeded by a higher and purer political tone.

Mr. GRANGER talks about the damage done by "the ignorant immigrant" to "the integrity and purity of our elections." Where has it appeared? He speaks of a few convictions of men for the fraudulent issue of naturalization papers, but these do not justify any "general belief" that such a crime is usual and frequent, though, unquestionably, whenever it is discovered it should be sharply punished, as was done in these cases, and every precaution taken to prevent it in all States.

Whether that outrage on the suffrage is frequent enough to justify his suggestion that "all outstanding certificates of naturalization be judicially revised" is doubtful; nor is it feasible. No evidence has appeared of any such large extent of fraud of this kind as to justify general suspicion of the naturalized. Outrages on the purity of the ballot which demand attention are of other sorts, and they are as frequent relatively among Americans of the old stock as among the naturalized citizens of foreign born parentage. The worst examples of the purchasing of votes of which there are indications are in rural communities where the percentage of the naturalized is much smaller than among the urban populations. For instance, it is likely to cost a candidate for Congress in a rural district very much more money for electioneering than a candidate has to put up in New York, where only about a sixth of the population is of native birth and parentage.

Mr. GRANGER seems to suggest that the integrity and purity of the ballot suffer especially from Slav immigrants. What evidence is there of such a result? The census statistics of 1900 showed that of foreign nationalities in New York, the Slavonic men over 21 years of age were more than the number of any other nationality except the German and Irish. The Latin races here, numerous then, have increased greatly in number since by reason of the flood of Italian immigration. But since these foreigners were added to the population, the town has increased in order and sobriety rather than fallen back. It is becoming a better city all the time, with less vice and drunkenness relatively and more advancement in the improvements of civilization. If you require a religious test you will find it in the generally more attentive observance of religious worship among these foreigners.

It is true that in 1900, of the possible white voting population of New York, less than 1 per cent. of the natives were illiterate, while of the foreign born the percentage was about 6, but among natives of both native and foreign parentage it was about the same, only 28 per cent. and 47 per cent., respectively, and therefore insignificant. Even of the naturalized foreign born, only 3.9 per cent. were illiterate in 1900. The evil of illiteracy in the citizenship is greatly exaggerated. There is no evidence to show that the illiterate voter is not as good a citizen as the literate. All the human virtues are not involved in the ability to read and write.

Mr. GRANGER suspects that "silence on this momentous question" is due to fear of the "size and potency" of the naturalized vote. So far as THE SUN is concerned, there is no such silence. But we do not assail the naturalized vote, for the simple reason that we have discovered nothing in American history since the rush of immigration began to bring to us twenty-five millions of foreigners which justifies any such assault. On the contrary, the results, both social and political, have been good. Our civilization has gained by the introduction of this foreign blood, American society has been liberalized and sweetened, and American progress has received from it only stimulation.

STEAD, the Carrier.

The Hon. WILLIAM T. STEAD, that pure and perpetual fountain, is spouting more refreshing ideas. He is going to bless London and the rest of mankind with a new daily paper. Now a daily *Stead* ought to be a sufficient boon in itself, but in this case the paper is only the nucleus of many services. It will be delivered at the houses of the fortunate subscribers by "bright young girls," who will receive advertisements and letters to the editor. There will be twenty *Steady* "depots," each with its post office, free telephone, reading room, circulating library, automatic restaurant. Doubtless smoking divans, bath-rooms, barbers' shops, manicure and massage parlors, corn cutters' boudoirs, grocers', "mercers", "chemists", "drapers" and dentists' shops will be added. Mr. STEAD is only making a beginning.

Mr. STEAD's subscribers can send in their orders for mutton chops, Brussels sprouts, anything to eat and everything to wear, to a "depot." The message will be taken to the "tradesmen" by the

effect the ignorant immigrant would have on our civilization and the integrity and purity of our elections.

Philosophy of the Woman's Postscript.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir, My quizzical critic, "L. T. H.," has not seemed to grasp the intent of my plea for a revival of the postscript to letters in such a way as to better the world, as has "L. T. H.," miss my meaning, and explain further how I account for this great lack of definite expression in feminine letters.

Formerly, after a woman had written her sweet nothings, child chat and gossip, and had signed her name, she wrote the letter to cross the 't's and dot the 'i's. That let her see what she wanted to say in the letter was not there, or, if there, simply unintelligible. She would then add the key to the letter by a one or two line "P. S.," now woman no longer does this. "L. T. H.," says the postscript is not missing, but he probably does not read many letters from women now.

Whether the side of a woman's "yes" or "no" may be on it, it takes no handwriting expert to detect which side "L. T. H." is on. Before you received the letter, "L. T. H.," said, "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached the old house with its picket fence, and your hand reached for the latch of the gate, who was it that tried to say "good-by" quickly? On Sunday nights when the married couples were out, and you had nudged up and gone out in the snow, who was it that lingered on the "mat" don't let us, "L. T. H.," on one side with "yes" and I on the other (perhaps) with "no," he should have said, "L. T. H.," "I am going to go so long." When you had taken "her" down the old road past the cemetery and over the creek bridge, and on returning had reached